

**Demand and the Reduction of Consumer Power in English Football: A Historical Case-Study of Newcastle United Fanzine, The Mag 1988-1999**

Journal:	<i>Soccer &amp; Society</i>
Manuscript ID	FSAS-2016-0043.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	neo-liberalism, football cultures, Newcastle United, Bourdieu, consumer culture

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Demand and the Reduction of Consumer Power in English Football: A Historical Case-Study of Newcastle United Fanzine, *The Mag* 1988-1999**

**Abstract**

Using a historically situated case study, this paper sets out to examine retrospective fan reactions towards the rise of commercialization at Newcastle United Football Club 1988-1999. Combining empirical evidence derived from a long serving NUFC fanzine with theoretical steer from the work of French Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, this article explains how fans at NUFC contributed towards their subordinate position during this period as business strategy and neo-liberal philosophy took hold. The work demonstrates that fans (seduced by a new business strategy for the club) embraced the label ‘consumer’ in an attempt to strengthen their position as important stakeholders and concomitantly, to improve their relationship with club owners. But, as the popularity of Premier League football increased over time and demand for season tickets began to outweigh supply, less affluent fans found themselves to be priced out of the market as business minded club owner’s prioritised profit over fan loyalty.

**Key Words:** neo-liberalism; football cultures; Newcastle United; Bourdieu; consumer culture.

In 2008 Peter Millward argued that sociologists of football ought to make better use of nonprofessional and nonofficial publications that are produced by fans of football for fans of football. Such publications are otherwise known as football fanzines and as Millward explains, they are likely to contain a potential rich source of information that is waiting for scholarly investigation.<sup>1</sup> One of the main benefits advocated by Millward for the use of fanzines is the potential to collate an inexpensive research sample of historically situated ‘practice specific documentary evidence’ that can be longitudinally analysed. Thus, it is argued that fanzines have the potential to reveal the transitional nature of fan cultures as fan-contributors make instantaneous reactions to emerging issues and then considered reflections thereafter.

Despite making this convincing argument, few scholars have taken up this challenge. Many have bypassed fanzines entirely to focus on e-zines - a contemporary online extension of the print fanzine. E-zines are largely preferred by scholars due to convenience, cost, and access

to instantaneous, momentary reactions of fans as they respond to contemporary issues.<sup>2</sup> Whilst no-doubt contributing valuable knowledge to the field, e-zine research often occurs in place of in-depth longitudinal analysis into those historical materials (stored within fanzine productions) which can offer further insight into revolutionary periods relating to the history of football fandom cultures.

In the current context, I turn to examine fan reactions towards the rise of commercialization in football, via an examination of Newcastle United Fanzine *The Mag (TM)* 1988-1999. In addition to the unique sample used, this paper makes an important theoretical contribution too. It draws the writings of Pierre Bourdieu as a means for explaining how it is that fandom cultures are made and remade across time and how fans contribute towards their inevitable subordination within neo-liberal political systems. This argument is significant, given that Bourdieu's theoretical writings (whilst used extensively in other research genres) have been largely overlooked in within the study of football consumption.<sup>3</sup> As such, it is appropriate at this point to provide a brief appraisal of Bourdieu's dominant thoughts relating to cultural reproduction and change.

### *Fields of Change*

Bourdieu explains that social life is made up of numerous structured domains or spaces that he labels as *fields*. He argues that fields (for example, a profession or a leisure pursuit), by their nature, tend to form distinct microcosms that are endowed with their own rules, regularities and forms of authority.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, he insists that those rules and regularities are upheld by agents in practice through a blend of structural constraint and free will.

To further explain this position, Bourdieu advocates a three level approach to the social scientific study of fields, beginning with analyse of 'habitus'. As he uses this term, habitus refers to individual traits, attitudes and dispositions that are inevitably influenced by history, traditions and cultures. With this in mind, Bourdieu is able to explain how it is that seemingly spontaneous individual action actually meets wider social expectations, and thus he makes clear that individual dispositions inevitably hold cultural characteristics. After all, values, dispositions and ways of life are passed (semi-consciously) between generations of people in

an active and reciprocal manner and therefore, habitus (masquerading as common sense) will directly influence action.

As a second feature Bourdieu asks scholars to consider the structure of the field in terms of relations between those involved within it. Here, he alludes to the fact that fields do not offer a universal experience to all agents due to the presence of ‘capital’. In this instance, capital refers to cultural (broadly relating to skills or titles that are held in high regard), economic (relating to material and financial assets) or social resources (significations of group membership) that are accrued and used by some to enhance position within the field. Consequently, he explains that authority, subordination and the desire of individuals to progress within the realm of any given field are crucial to its future direction. Finally, Bourdieu insists that it is important to monitor the influence of wider social power (external to the field) such as the effect of government, law and business. Each, he infers, has the potential to infiltrate and effect action within specific cultural fields.

Thus, using this three stage blend, Bourdieu is able to effectively articulate how fields evolve over time as configurations of capital change in relation to internal power struggles and wider social trends that emerge or wain within and between fields. Consequently, Bourdieu concedes that habitus is inevitably generational and in specific moments of time and space cultural practice can suffer ‘the hysteresis effect’. He writes:

As a result of the hysteresis effect...practices are always liable to incur negative sanctions when the environment with which they are actually confronted is too distant from that to which they are objectively fitted.<sup>5</sup>

Here, Bourdieu describes the outcomes of a situation when the field undergoes major crisis and its regularities and normalities are profoundly changed as a consequence of modern conditions of existence that force agents to adapt thought patterns and concomitant practice.

Before applying this theoretical model to the experiences of football fans (via the current sample of fanzine subscriptions 1988-1999) it is useful to recall the situation facing English football prior to and including *TM*'s maiden year of publication in season 1988-89

### ***English Football in Context: The Rise of Consumer Culture 1985-1989***

English football had, during the 1970s and 1980s, become notorious as a problematic pastime due to its association with football hooliganism.<sup>6</sup> The frequent reporting of acts of violence at football matches reached its peak when in May 1985, at the European Cup Final at Heysel, Brussels, the behaviour of some Liverpool fans caused the death of 39 Juventus supporters.<sup>7</sup> The immediate reaction by the games governing body (FIFA) to ban English clubs from European competition had financial implications for English football, not only due to the illegibility to compete in European competitions, but also due to the position that television companies did not want to be associated with a sport, whose image had fallen into disrepute.

It was not until the television rights deal of 1988 that domestic television companies (BBC and ITV) began to compete with more vigour to televise English football. Competition was enhanced to a large extent by the advance of neo-liberal political and economic philosophy, used by UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to legitimate an attack on 'big government' and the bureaucratic welfare state with a neo-liberal policy mix that was based on free trade and the establishment of the open economy.<sup>8</sup> As David Conn reports, in the decade of Thatcherism money was an end in itself, and football was not immune from this:

The Prime Minister had infamously said that there was no such thing as society, only people trying to make money...Everything was subjected to market forces.<sup>9</sup>

In the case of English football, Thatcher made possible competition from global television companies, into what had been, a closed, incestuous domestic market. For instance, in 1988 Sky television became embroiled in a three-way competition (with ITV and BBC) and consequently the money paid to the Football League (FL) began to increase. On this occasion ITV paid £44 million for a four year deal; whereas a two year contract had cost only £4.5 million in 1983.<sup>10</sup>

Removed from the issue of television rights, the financial state of English football was a concern to many football clubs during the 1980s. It was acknowledged that football could no

longer support itself solely through its traditional means of gate revenue. Again, stimulated by neo-liberal economic philosophy, this issue instigated a debate about the potential merits of shirt sponsorship, with the Football Association (FA) and the FL initially opposed this idea. According to King it seemed as though the prospect of losing control (as advertisements and the free market began to take over football) was a frightening proposition to them.<sup>11</sup> However in 1983, despite attempts to stem the tide of free market interference in football, the League surrendered its position in relation to an ultimatum from big city teams, stating that they would sign an independent television contract if the league did not approve shirt advertisements. With nowhere to go (based on the fact that League television revenue was dependent on the attraction of big city clubs) shirt advertisements were now made permissible.

The stalling from English football's administrators with regards to matters of free market involvement (typified above) was frustrating to many fans too, and arguably this was reflected in low aggregate football crowds of approximately 12,000 throughout much of the early 1980s.<sup>12</sup> For instance, in 1982, Richard Rider of the Times newspaper makes reference to footballs decline in popularity on the grounds of lack of investment. He writes:

The reality is that spectators...do not visit football grounds as pilgrims rediscovering their roots and reliving the discomfort tolerated by their fathers...While cinemas, pubs and other places of entertainment have had to modernise their facilities to meet the expanding and more discerning demands of the consumer, football grounds remain as relics of the pre-war period. Who at the age of 30, longs to stand on a windy terrace, watching two mediocre teams when warmth and television beckon?<sup>13</sup>

Amongst other possible causes then, lack of customer services and customer care were listed as a potential contributory factor towards the demise in the aggregate of live football crowds.<sup>14</sup> Negligence and ill treatment of fans was most poignantly demonstrated through the football disasters of 1985 (the Bradford City fire) and 1989 (The Hillsborough Stadium disaster) resulting in two major government inquiries. The Popplewell report of 1986 and the Taylor report of 1990 sought to discuss issues of safety, crowd control and the subsequent financial investment (based on neo-liberal economic philosophy) that would be needed to realize the long term sustainability and growth of the English football industry. Amidst

concerns for safety and the legal obligation for clubs in the top two tiers of English football to change previously standing-room-only terraces to all-seated stadia, it was argued that fans should be centralized in a conscious attempt to rebrand football as a safe, enjoyable leisure pursuit and viable business.<sup>15</sup>

This proposition was no doubt enhanced by the 1982 decision to remove a regulation which restricted the maximum dividend that shareholders could accrue from football clubs. As such, new style entrepreneur investors were attracted to the game and this had implications for the ownership dynasties of the post-war period, as they began to look amateurish or inadequate by comparison. In line with free-market arguments, there was an emerging acceptance that football clubs should be profit-making, and as such, business acumen and long-term business vision was gaining cultural capital within football. Initially new directors of football would be expected to make large scale investments, but the long-term aim should be to return a profit.

Having outlined those changes to football culture that were taking place prior to and simultaneously with the first publication of the *TM*, in what follows I examine the practice specific documentary evidence (outlined in *TM*) to demonstrate the impact of commercialization from the perspective of those directly implicated.

## Methodology

### *The Fanzine: Brief Context*

As a reaction to some of those issues cited above, not to mention a more computer literate society and the relatively cheap cost of and printing in 1970s-1980s Britain, fans began to produce print fanzines to provide a platform for sharing their ideas and fears about the game.<sup>16</sup> The first football fanzine '*Foul*' typified this process. It was produced in 1972 for £54.00 (circa 1,000 copies) on a borrowed typewriter in the student union at Cambridge University and then distributed to outlets in Cambridge from the back of a car.<sup>17</sup> *Foul* was a successful alternative 'zine' that experimented with humour, but more importantly, its success indicated that there was demand for club specific fanzines that would allow fans (whose views were often repressed through official club publications and mainstream media) to express themselves. In this regard Roger Domeneghetti, explains how the views of fans

were often repressed by mainstream media, and that fanzine editors provided the venue for fans to have their say, publically. In an interview with Domeneghetti, one editor explained:

‘we were inundated with letters...People used to think we made them up, but we didn’t have to. Fanzines gave people an outlet that they didn’t have at the time.’<sup>18</sup>

The mid to late 1980s saw the rise of a spate of publications including national production *When Saturday Comes* (launched in 1986) and a whole host of other, more localized, club based texts with a rise in fanzine production from only three in 1986, to over one-thousand in 1992.<sup>19</sup>

At NUFC (the chosen site for analysis) various fanzines were created, some having only fleeting print lives, others more enduring. NUFC fanzines have included, *Half Mag*, *Half Biscuit* (reference to a 1980s band from Birkenhead, Merseyside), 1992; *Mighty Quinn* (acknowledging striker Micky Quinn and the Bob Dylan song of the same title), 1990; *Talk of the Toon*, 1991; *The Flying Magpie*, 1995; *The Giant Awakes*, 1993; *Toon Army News*, 1993; *Who Wants to be in Division 1 Anyway*, 1989; *Once Upon a Tyne*, 1989; and *Jims Bald Heed* (referring to manager Jim Smith), 1989. The focus of this investigation, however, is Newcastle United supporters earliest and longest running fanzine, *The Mag (TM)*. In total there were 289 printed issues over 26 years, covering the period August 1988 – April 2014.

[Note: Insert figure 1 here]

**Sample and Data Analysis**

The sample for this investigation spans a portion of the publication life of *TM*, 1988-1999. This period was chosen because it offers evidence of the experiences of NUFC fans during a revolutionary time of change for English football that saw the implications of the Bradford fire and Hillsborough stadium disaster inquiries (1986 and 1990 respectively), the inauguration of the Premier League (1992) and its association with Sky television, the increasing neo-liberal business strategies applied by football clubs, and the concomitant evolution of the club / fan relationship.

Given that the author set out to purchase a full collection of fanzines from various internet outlets and private sellers for the purpose of historical longitudinal analysis, in one sense the



sampling technique used may be best described as a purposive<sup>20</sup>. However, as the author was unable to access the full collection of published fanzines, a convenience sample of available editions became the focus of the analysis. 77, out of a possible 129 editions (produced from April 1988 – December 1999) were available for analysis, including multiple examples from each of the 11 years under investigation (see table 1 below)

[Note Insert Table 1 here]

As a media text that typically combines images and words in a complex pastiche, *TM* is amenable to established methods of critical discourse analysis, familiar to the field of linguistics and media studies. In this instance however, the aim is not to analyse language and image production at a micro level, but rather it is to galvanize discursive themes of fan rhetoric and communication as it exists in relation to the commercialization of football, over time. In this way qualitative thematic analysis, characterized by a combination of empiricism and theory is used to bring meaning to the discussion of dominant and reoccurring issues in light of the theorist Pierre Bourdieu.

### ***Data Analysis***

Each magazine was read (in its entirety, including front covers and all articles) for content pertinent to the commercialization of football. Once identified as appropriate for further analysis, relevant articles were used as raw data to be analysed using a framework of thematic analysis as described by Miles, Huberman and Saldana.<sup>21</sup> Articles were read number of times to gain a thorough understanding of content. They were then re-read in full, and emergent patterns were recorded on each transcript. The emergent patterns were then summarized and organized to establish any inter relations between them. Thus, those patterns that shared certain characteristics with one another were grouped together to form a new general category. Accordingly, new thematic categories were tested against earlier transcripts in a cyclical fashion until saturation. The aim of this process was to produce a thorough and accurate description of the range of opinions, experiences and reactions expressed by fans (over the duration of 11 years) in relation to commercialization. Whilst it is not possible to include extracts from all 77 of the editions analysed, the findings that follow summarise the

generic themes extracted from the analysis and they are largely arranged in chronological order.

*Precursor to TM: NUFC in 1987.*

Before providing space to discuss the main themes generated from data analysis, it is worth briefly outlining the situation at NUFC prior to *TM* first edition in August 1988. The main issues affecting fans of NUFC were that the West Stand had been condemned in 1985 in the aftermath of the Bradford fire and a new stand would be completed in time for season 1988-89. The board, figure-headed by Gordon McKeag had declared a shortage of money to improve the football ground and consequently, star players: Chris Waddle, Peter Beardsley and Paul Gascoigne (all born in Newcastle Upon Tyne) had recently been sold by the board prior to the first edition of *TM* coming into print.

**Embracing the Prospect of Neo-liberal Leadership at NUFC as a Positive Evolutionary Step**

***Theoretical Prologue: Bourdieu on Neo-liberalism***

Neo-liberal economic philosophy is driven by policies (such as privatization, fiscal austerity, deregulation, free trade and reductions in government spending) that enhance the role of the private sector in the economy, under the guise that this is the best way to stimulate economic growth, and consequently, to benefit all citizens. Whilst Bourdieu argues that the alleged utilitarian outcomes of neo-liberalism are illusory, he is, nonetheless taken by the overwhelming success of neo-liberal persuasion and marketing. Neo-liberal economic policies, after all, are presented in the language of mathematics and this, he asserts, is partially responsible for its meteoric rise and acceptance within public consciousness. Presented in this way, Bourdieu argues that neo-liberal philosophy becomes detached from real life to give the impression of scientific credibility along with the power to argue for the inevitability of its proposals and solutions.

In doing so, he argues that neo-liberalism can present itself as progressive, when in fact it is conservative and allows for forms of economic regression to be passed off as reform and

1  
2  
3 revolution.<sup>22</sup> Consequently, then the neo-liberal revolution is symbolic as well as economic  
4 and social, given that its arguments are presented as inevitable logic rather than a political  
5 intention. Despite the fact that this system greatly favours those who already own large  
6 amounts of economic capital (and associated symbolic capital), social agents are coerced into  
7 believing that the game is fair and that everyone profits from ‘free markets’. He uses this as an  
8 example of the power of ‘misrecognition’, where certain individuals benefit without appearing  
9 to do so in the eyes of the repressed. This results in a situation of ‘symbolic violence’, in  
10 which the dominated are complicit in their own subordination.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 In what follows this position is evidenced in light of the thoughts of football fans as they  
18 discuss the desired future progression of their football club.  
19  
20  
21

### 22 ***The Calm Before the Storm: Adopting the Term ‘Consumer’***

23  
24

25 When *TM* was published for the first time in 1988, narratives were not only in favour of the  
26 modernization of football generally, but more specifically, fans of NUFC were particularly  
27 vocal in their disdain for a system of institutional management that was perceived to be  
28 outdated, inefficient and unsuitable for the modern game:  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 The Newcastle United Chairman [Gordon McKeag] ... has recently referred to  
34 the club as *family silver*. This sums up the absolute contempt that the board has  
35 for the fans... we...turn up every week like sheep. We pay to watch rubbish and  
36 keep this selfish, small minded group of men in power...The boards main  
37 ambition, is not to win trophies, I’m afraid it’s simply to stay in control with  
38 anything else secondary.<sup>23</sup>  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 The negative reaction to the phrase ‘family silver’ (allegedly used by NUFC Chairman above)  
48 is made in response to the perceived unchallenged post-war Dynasty of leadership at NUFC  
49 and a growing frustration felt by fans towards the non-democratic nature of football  
50 institutions per-se. Gordon McKeag, (the subject of the *TM* article above) was appointed to  
51 the board of NUFC in 1972 on the death of his father William McKeag, a situation that was  
52 not unique to fans of NUFC, or indeed to English football. Moorehouse, for instance, has  
53 previously noted a similar issue in relation to Celtic fanzine ‘*Not The View*’, where the White  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

and Kelly families (former board members and major shareholders at Celtic Rangers Football Club [CRFC]) were alleged to have referred to CRFC as a precious heirloom to be handed down from generation to generation.<sup>24</sup>

Likewise, from the very first issue of *TM*, the message promoted to the readership sought to condemn this seemingly incestuous leadership style and to embrace more forward thinking commercially minded strategies that were emerging elsewhere in the British leisure sector.<sup>25</sup> In conjunction with this, fans at NUFC (1988) began to cast criticism towards the ownership and management structure (that was perceived to be stale) by declaring interest in a business proposal, put forward by *The Magpie Group* (a consortium of local business-men) headed by John Hall - pictured below (left) alongside chairman, Gordon McKeag (right) in issue 2 of *TM*. Hall (now, Sir John Hall, MBE) is a self-made millionaire that arose to prominence as the mastermind behind the Newcastle and Gateshead Metro Centre, a purpose built shopping complex, which at the time of build, was Britain's largest.<sup>26</sup> By 1988, Hall was able to sell his stake in this £270 million retail development at an estimated £50 million profit, freeing monies to invest in and potentially to revolutionize NUFC.<sup>27</sup>

[Note: Insert Figure 2 here]

The proposal put forward by the Magpie Group laid down the following conditions. The group would revitalize the board, but not necessarily overthrow it. They would raise money by implementing a share issue for fans. They would inject five million pounds immediately, increase democracy by removing absolute power from a small minority of people, redevelop the ground and call a halt to selling players to rebalance the books.<sup>28</sup> In an interview with Tyne Tees News (12<sup>th</sup> October 1988), John Hall made the following case:

The present chairman said that we were trying to buy the family silver. That is why it is time for change. I challenge the chairman to tell the fans why; if their money is good enough, if it's clean enough to go through the stalls, why is it so dirty that they can't have any shares? It's an upstairs, downstairs situation. It isn't their silver! [referring to board members and stakeholders] It's all our silver in the north-east.<sup>29</sup>

1  
2  
3 Drawing on their cultural capital as experienced businessmen with a business strategy backed  
4 by accumulated economic capital, the *Magpie Group* began communicating with and winning  
5 the support of fans long before they had secured any business deal. Using the mass media as a  
6 tool for information dissemination, and also targeting new football fanzines, they began to  
7 apply a simple series of public relations exercises that were common to the world of business  
8 but were strangely lacking in the world of football.<sup>30</sup>  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 For instance, speaking in issue 2 (September 1988), Malcolm Dix (A member of the *Magpie*  
15 *Group* and chairman of Newcastle Sports Council at this time) revealed plans that the group  
16 would attempt to acquire 51 percent of the shares at NUFC and describes how this would  
17 affect the running of the football club.<sup>31</sup> More significantly, Dix spoke enthusiastically about  
18 how fans would be affected by subsequent changes, and revealed plans for a share flotation  
19 that would afford fans the opportunity to buy a stake in the club, and concurrently present  
20 future opportunities to elect a fan representative to sit on the board. Dix was careful to  
21 highlight the importance of the NUFC customer base to the future success of the club.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 In line with calls for a business-like approach to the running of the football club, and in  
30 recognition of the potential power that fans could yield if they visualized themselves as  
31 consumers, *TM* editorial team asked the readership to consider boycotting a forthcoming  
32 match in order to show support for the *Magpie Group*. In turn, it was argued that this mode of  
33 behaviour (boycott) would demonstrate the potential financial loss that could be suffered by  
34 the directors when fans act with unity and hold back customer spending:  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Let's get things straight, John Hall is not trying to create a dictatorship at NUFC as  
41 the board would like to insinuate. He and his group are merely trying to open the  
42 running of the club and give everybody a say in a new and exciting future. Now I  
43 think it's up to us, the ordinary supporters to show our support for change because the  
44 alternative is, I'm afraid, 30 more years of lack of achievement. The only way to have  
45 any power is to stay away i.e. a boycott of matches.<sup>32</sup>  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 By issue 14 (February 1990) it was evident that fans were now using the language of  
54 consumerism and their role as consumers to make the case for change. Contributor, Tony  
55 Pearson argued that the business of football ought to adhere to the same rules as any other  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

business. He wrote:

If they do not attract *customers* in their market then profits will drop and cash flow will suffer. The same principles apply to Newcastle United than they do to your local chip shop.<sup>33</sup>

The line of reasoning adopted (above) suggests that if football fans could reconceptualise themselves as consumers (as well as supporters) then they could use this as a position of power to campaign for inclusion in club matters. After all, the free-market is dependent on consumers for successful trade and thus, fans were approaching interactions with cultural superiors (i.e. through the media and at football matches), not as passive subjects, but rather as important players in the destiny of the field. Thus, in the same vein that scholars Kennedy and Kennedy have expressed, the language of commerce was rapidly internalized and embraced by fans that were attempting to balance notions of 'tradition' with a willingness to acknowledge and carefully consider the needs of business strategies.<sup>34</sup> After all, the unsatisfactory conditions of 1970s-80s were fresh in the minds of football fans that were determined to better their circumstances. Consequently, this meant giving free market conditions their full support.<sup>35</sup>

Messages of support for neo-liberal leadership continued through into 1991-1992, with for example, criticism of McKeag in issue 23 (January 1991) for getting the club into 'frightening debt', and for 'returning low gates'<sup>36</sup>; whilst in issue 28 (September 1991) attention was drawn to the need for businessmen with 'cash and business acumen':

The Noades, Silvers, Dans and Walkers (club owners and businessmen) are providing what the game needs, cash and business acumen...All the genuine Super League contenders are backed by rich benefactors. Liverpool, Everton, Leeds, Manchester United and Arsenal are all backed by rich benefactors...Is it a coincidence that these clubs win trophies? Newcastle is sadly a notable exception to this group.<sup>37</sup>

By the time issue 31 was in print (December 1991), McKeag, Seymour and Cushing had stepped down from the board to be replaced by John Hall (Chairman), Fred Shepard and Derick McVickers. A contributor to *TM* (December 1991) summed this up with the following

statement:

This had to happen; you can't have someone with almost half the shares not involved in the running of the club. It's a harsh fact, but we need people with money on board and these appear to be the people prepared to help ease our financial situation.<sup>38</sup>

Hall had been steadily buying up shares in NUFC since 1988 and by the end of 1992 he had increased his shareholding to 90 percent. This signified a new era for fans of NUFC.

### **Be Careful What You Wish For: Demand and the Reduction of Consumer Power**

#### ***Theoretical Prologue: The Double-bind***

For Bourdieu, the effects of cultural change on individuals will inevitably yield unexpected consequences for everyday practice, and those consequences are not always positive. In essence, individuals can be caught up in contradictory situations and Bourdieu refers to these as 'double-binds'. Put simply, when double bind situations occur, agents do not know whether to trust the past, present or future as the rules of the game (previously internalized by the individual as part of their habitus) are altered into a new, unfamiliar formula<sup>39</sup>. People can, of course change their habitus in new environments, but it is difficult given that the original habitus is inscribed on body, mind and emotions, and is never completely forgotten. In the case of a double-bind, then, mixed messages between the field and habitus result in conflicting action, a kind of social schizophrenia, in response to field conditions as they move beyond the habitus and render previously internalized structural and dispositional properties, outdated, or unable to respond to the reality of the field.

Thus, it is the unintended, unexpected consequences encountered by fans at NUFC, as an outcome of the willing support for an intensifying commercial culture at the club that takes the focus of the remainder of this paper.

#### ***Don't Panic!***

Despite vocalising support for neo-liberal leadership at NUFC, fans in *TM* were



1  
2  
3 simultaneously feeling uneasy about new business-like strategies that were beginning to  
4 infiltrate football. For instance, running along-side support for John Hall and his commercial  
5 strategies, in issues 14 and 16,<sup>40</sup> contributors draw with scepticism on Hall's business  
6 entrepreneurialism with specific reference to his experience as the developer of the metro  
7 centre, and they speculate (with comic effect) how this might affect stadium developments at  
8 St. James Park (SJP):  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14       The whole of one end of the ground will be transformed into a fantasy themed  
15 world with exciting rides, wave pool, ice rink, aquarium and twelve screen  
16 cinemas. The other end will be redeveloped as a food hall, where the continual  
17 flow-through of customers can choose from a variety of authentic mini portion  
18 tasters...Another top priority will be to build Europe's longest monorail train link  
19 to connect the stadium with the plastic world. Shoppers could therefore  
20 experience both of these environments without ever going out into the cold.<sup>41</sup>  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Whilst Hall had not taken control of the club at this point in time (1990), fans were aware of  
28 his reputation and were preparing themselves for the strategies that might be implemented if  
29 Hall was to gain a majority shareholding in the club. Predating Bryman who explains that  
30 more and more sectors of society are taking on the characteristics of a Disney theme park<sup>42</sup>  
31 (that is, by illustrating the commonality of a series of procedures that are taken to ensure the  
32 satisfaction of consumers and to offer new strategies for selling in post-Fordist times)  
33 contributors (above) make reference to the fictional but satirical fantasy world that would  
34 integrate hybrid consumption opportunities into the live match-day experience.<sup>43</sup>  
35 Furthermore, Hall's reputation as a formidable businessman and his perceived  
36 uncompromising nature was, at times, reported with caution.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Amidst current rumours that Hall was interfering with team selection, a more alarming  
46 situation held the attention of Howard Linskey in Issue 18.<sup>44</sup> This was related to a newsprint  
47 article in which Hall had suggested that if, in the future, he could not develop St. James Park  
48 (SJP) as he would like (due to council and local resident interference), he would consider the  
49 possibility of a ground sharing scheme that would include the abandonment of SJP, a move to  
50 Washington (Tyne and Wear) and a potential ground share with Sunderland AFC. This led  
51 the editor into a state of moral panic:  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 He has got to be kidding! Has he got no idea how unpalatable that this would be  
4 to your average Newcastle fan? I would have thought that John Hall of all people  
5 would appreciate that NUFC is not anyone's personal property. It belongs to the  
6 people of Newcastle...  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Thus, fans were not completely opposed to change but they tended to display angst when  
12 feelings of security were breached because of it. Consequently, whilst subtle alterations in  
13 practice might be palatable, dramatic change is often met with resistance. As Stephen Wagg  
14 explains, throughout the 1990s football would increasingly feature as a site of cultural  
15 contestation and it was fanzines that were to provide the platform to report and stimulate  
16 cultural resistance.<sup>45</sup> In the case of NUFC fans, it seems that contributors would use *TM* to  
17 remind Hall, and to reaffirm with each-other that change should be respectful and in keeping  
18 with customs and traditions, where possible.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 ***Demand and the Reduction of Consumer Power***

28  
29  
30 From 1993 *TM* was reflective of the jubilant feelings of supporters in relation to on field  
31 performances. Kevin Keegan had been in post as temporary manager of the first team since  
32 the end of season 1991-92 and had managed to rescue NUFC from entering the third division.  
33 In the following season 1992-93 performances further improved and NUFC gained  
34 promotion to the newly coined 'Premier League' in time for season 1993-94. The Premier  
35 League, having commercial independence from the FA was formed in 1992 when the teams  
36 in the then 'First Division' broke away from the rest of the football league to ensure that  
37 England's most successful teams would retain most of their television revenue. This new,  
38 bold arrangement would replace the old system where television money was shared between  
39 all league members regardless of whether or not they had appeared on TV that season.<sup>46</sup> In  
40 relation to *TM*, fans were both positively and negatively affected by this change. Mark Jenson  
41 writes:  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 As with anything in life, when changes happen they always have good and bad points.  
52 On the plus side, there's always a big match each week, more media coverage, extra  
53 finance coming into the club and a competitive edge. However there is also a down  
54 side with many people struggling to get into the matches, games shifted all over the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

place for Sky... It's a big change but I think both players and supporters are learning all the time.<sup>47</sup>

Arguably then, the situation described above is representative of the paradoxical relationship that exists between televised football and football fans - under the guise of neo-liberalism. For instance, Ed Horton indicates that consumers are not always equal in the eyes of football. He explains that both television and fans are consumers of the game, but there's a difference. Where gate money from fans used to be the primary source of income for football clubs, television is now responsible for substantially increasing revenues. With this in mind, he asks:

'If the customer is always right, to which customer is football going to defer?'<sup>48</sup>

The simple answer is that football defers to television and this often occurs at the expense of fan 'tradition'.<sup>49</sup> For example, the 'traditional' 3pm Saturday kick-off (dating back to the origins of the professional game in the 1880s [made possible by the implementation of the Saturday-half holiday - freeing workers on Saturday afternoons]) was quickly phased out in order that Sky could maximise TV revenue by scheduling matches throughout each week to coincide with national and global audiences. This issue was discussed on numerous occasions<sup>50</sup> where fans would field arguments in relation to the desirable effect of television, versus the dumbing down of fan culture as a result of the heavy folktale TV narratives and match analysis.<sup>51</sup> In an open letter discussing the effect of Sky television on the terrestrial broadcasting of English football, one Mr. Milton wrote:

...There's not bloody much football on TV at all. A total of 2 and a half hours per week at a maximum from the Beeb, this included ¾ hour highlights on Sportsnight (usually around midnight), ½ hour of football focus... Match of the day is the most popular football show and is usually on for around an hour... Anyway this leaves ¼ hour of highlights spread around the week on the news and Look North.

Compare this measly output with the 25 hours plus that Sky serves up... Now I can't afford the £20 rental nor the £200 or so it takes to install a dustbin lid... but for what I've seen of live matches in the pub it shows that Sky is years ahead of the BBC when it comes to the build-up and live content of games. Watching the pre-match build-up of the Liverpool game was fascinating, almost every aspect was explored, I was surprised even the worms in the pitch were not asked their views.<sup>52</sup>

Thus, despite casting dispersions on the economic price associated with Sky TV, there is a general acceptance that the coverage of football is of high quality and thus, desirable. Moreover, for Richard Giulianotti, televised football has rapidly become a simulation of the authentic stadium experience, which in turn, has simultaneously began to morph with the expectations of the televised format.<sup>53</sup> For example, *TM* contributor Kevin Parker, talks specifically about the emerging pre-match ‘razzmatazz’ at SJP (implemented under the leadership of John Hall), including the presence of new Master of Ceremonies (MC) that Parker implies, was employed to stimulate an atmospheric stadium; and a pre-match scratch-card game, both of which he asserts ‘the average two year old would find patronizing’. He also makes comment on the half-time exhibition provided by dancing girls; a display that he asserts has ‘no pretence of routine, just eight good looking girls...I’ve got no idea what the women [female supporters] were supposed to get out of it’.<sup>54</sup>

However, far from mocking all new forms of match-day entertainment and calling for a return to ‘tradition’, Parker was merely protesting about the type of entertainment currently on offer. He was alive to the notion that fan participation in the match day setting is crucial to both the football club and television in order to create the spectacle required to attract commercial sponsorship.<sup>55</sup> On this basis, Parker made the following call: ‘spend some of the new money on giant TV screens’. After all, ‘before the game they could show highlights of previous games...at half time they could show highlights of the previous 45 minutes’. In sum, Parker’s main message to John Hall and to the readership of *TM* was that when it comes to new forms of entertainment offered to fans, ‘the most important fact should be that [new consumption experiences] should be what the fans (i.e. paying customers) want’. He insists, ‘if enough of us make some noise then just maybe someone up their will take notice’.<sup>56</sup>

In issue 65 (July 1994), however, it is clear that club directors were not only interested in creating a strong consumer relationship with fans, but they were also setting out new initiatives that would differentiate one fan experience from another, whilst increasing club revenue in the process. For instance, Mark Jenson set out to address rumours that the club would launch a new bond scheme. The finer details were sketchy and reliant on mass media reports that were drawing on information leaked by the club, but the following appeared to be true. Season ticket holders could elect to pay a £500 one-off fee to guarantee first option on specific seats for ten years, but the club were insistent that the bond was simply a choice for

supporters to make. Whilst not entirely dismissive, initial interpretations in *TM* were met with caution:

Fine so far. More money for the club and nobody is apparently being adversely affected by it. However the thing that worries every fan that I've spoken to is will it be compulsory in the future?<sup>57</sup>

Fans were conscious that football had suddenly become fashionable and at NUFC demand outweighed supply. This being so, season ticket holders were anxious that the choice element relating to the purchase of bonds would not last, and many predicted that in the future, bonds would become mandatory, or else season-tickets would be offered to those willing to purchase a bond.<sup>58</sup> Such sentiment was typified in satire cartoons, such as those identified below:

*[Note: Insert figure 3 here]*

The main issue raised, in this respect, is that contributors felt that NUFC were privileging those (in the moment) with greater financial resources; and thus erasing, or at least devaluing, all previous history of financial support made by less affluent fans across previous decades. According to multiple scholars, such criticisms were commonplace amongst fans of 'bigger' football clubs, where poorer spectators were being deliberately squeezed out as free market principles began to rule football.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, *TM*'s Kevin Parker (Issue 69) argues that the same business-minded strengths that were responsible for turning the fortunes of the club were now beginning to cause problems for less affluent fans. Parker recognises that 'it is good business to give preferential treatment in this way, just as there is no financial pressure to increase the number of phone lines in the general sales and ticket office, or remove the use of 089 numbers in order to maximise income from every received call'. In other words, when demand outweighs supply it appears that the customer is not always right:

As long as the waiting list to get into the ground remains you better get used to being a second class fan .... There's only one choice. If you can afford it, buy a bond.<sup>60</sup>

Fans were also disturbed by further evidence of the conspicuous economic means separation

1  
2  
3 within the stadium through further initiatives such as the '1892 club' which was perceived by  
4 the readership of *TM* to benefit those supporters with greater financial resources - as figure 4  
5 (below) indicates.  
6  
7

8  
9 *[Note: Insert figure 4 here]*  
10

11  
12 For those readers unsure of what the '1892 Club' stood for (other than the NUFC's official  
13 year of birth) and wondered about the reference to £1500, contributor Mark Jensen explained:  
14  
15

16  
17 For those of you who haven't heard about it, the club offered 300 season tickets  
18 for sale at £1500 under the title of the '1892 Club'. The main benefit of this  
19 appears to be that they have there own lounge at the back of the Leazes End  
20 which means they don't have to rub shoulders with the rif raf at half time. It  
21 seems transparently obvious that this is again aimed at the business community  
22 and is at the expense of those who have patiently bided their time on the season  
23 ticket waiting list.<sup>61</sup>  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 By 1999, the price of season tickets had increased by an average of 300 percent since the  
31 formation of the Premier League in 1993<sup>62</sup> Yet, price hikes had little effect at St. James Park  
32 given that season tickets had sold out and new seating was in the process of completion,  
33 extending capacity to 52,000 (the second largest stadium in England at the time). Generally  
34 speaking, stadium development was welcomed by most fans as a progressive step, but in  
35 issue 127 (October 1999) the moral leadership at NUFC was brought into question once more  
36 by 4,000 fans with season tickets in the Millburn stand and Leazes end of SJP. To explain,  
37 those fans had each received a letter from the club stating that unless they were willing to pay  
38 £1,350 or £995 respectively for the seat that they had occupied in previous seasons (making  
39 new tickets approximately £500 more expensive), they would be moved to alternative seats in  
40 the new upper tiers. This strategy, based on sound economic logic, ensured that the club  
41 would secure an extra £3 million per annum<sup>63</sup>; yet for NUFC fans the situation was  
42 unpalatable given that half of those affected were bondholders who had recently paid £500 in  
43 1994 in order to give them an option on a specific seat for ten years.<sup>64</sup>  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Outraged by this proposition *TM* gave space to display the original letters to and the  
55 responses from fans as they occurred. For example, see below extracts from the letter of Mr  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Fimister (Millburn Stand: Seat F48) to the then chairman, Freddie Fletcher:

...I appreciate that the club has to continue to progress and realize that corporate hospitality is an essential part of the modern game, but at what expense...If the unthinkable happened and the club were relegated, where would the corporate seats be then?.. What about bond holders that have been promised their seat for 10 years? Is it right to move them now? Please think again about this shoddy treatment of real supporters who support the best team in the land.<sup>65</sup>

This correspondence with the club provides insight into the experiences of fans like Mr. Fimister who were beginning to feel distanced from the NUFC leadership as a consequence of corporate seats being given primacy over all others in the stadium redesign. With this in mind, cartoonist Joe McKeough attempts to capture the potential future implications of such club policies.

*[Note: Insert figure 5 here]*

In the first example (above, left), McKeough attempts to demonstrate that the current pricing and ticket allocation policy at NUFC could lead to a lost generation of fans. He hints that the decedents of the current supporter group (those negatively affected by club policy) will become disillusioned with the club, and eventually, disengage. In the end, stadium accessibility for many children, he claims, will be a work of fiction. Additionally, in the second example (above, right), two affluent fans discuss ticket accessibility for all. Blinded by their accrued social and economic capital they fail to see, or choose not to see the point of view of ‘oiks’ (working class people) as they complain about the ticket sales strategy at NUFC.

Similar findings were raised by King, when a group of Manchester United fans reported that emerging club policies (such as the global marketing of the club and the active courtship of a professional class of fans) were responsible for their financial exclusion from the stadium as demand outweighed supply<sup>66</sup>. Guilianotti, Morrow, Crabbe and Brown and McGill add to this, when they further explain that the inevitable fragmentation of the supporter base, on the grounds identified above, only serves to intensify opportunities for exploitation.<sup>67</sup> After all, as Lord Justice Taylor in his final report on the Hillsborough Stadium disaster points out,

1  
2  
3 supporters are not real consumers with real choice. Football fans may complain and campaign  
4 for change but they possess a genuine form of emotional labour that serves to encourage  
5 inelastic consumerist activity towards their club.<sup>68</sup>  
6

7  
8 Thus, whilst *TM* cannot claim to instigate practical change, it did appear to serve  
9 therapeutic purposes as the moral voice of exploited fans. Contributors would use *TM* to draw  
10 attention to the negative effects of commercial policies on those fans with limited economic  
11 capital, but a history of support that pre-dates Premier League football. More specifically, the  
12 following rallying call typifies this movement as Mick Edmondson galvanizes *TM* readership  
13 to protest against the attempt of the board to move 4,000 fans into cheaper seats in order to  
14 make room for affluent supporters:  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 It is quite clear that the board of directors couldn't care less about the fans. Their  
22 sole interest is wallets...we must put an end to being treat as second class  
23 citizens...If you've got NUFC in your blood, write to the local and national  
24 papers, your MP, the FSA (Football Supporters Association), and also football  
25 governing bodies, even Tony Blair...Stand up and be counted against Derby live  
26 on Sky.<sup>69</sup>  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 In circular fashion, the politically active role that *TM* had taken in 1988 (calling for a boycott  
33 of matches in support of John Hall) had returned once more in 1999 (this time John Hall and  
34 Fred Shepard were adversaries), weaponized by the coverage of Sky TV, enabling, in the  
35 views of NUFC fans, the global shaming of club policy. *TM* supported the 'Save Our Seats'  
36 (SOS) campaign, with some contributors taking to the law courts to resist the set actions of  
37 the club leadership. However, after two high-court cases, the club was allowed to move fans  
38 as they had proposed, under an exceptional circumstances clause.<sup>70</sup> As a gesture of goodwill,  
39 the club did not pursue fans for legal costs awarded over their insured limit.<sup>71</sup>  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 Conclusion

47  
48  
49

50 Drawing on the theoretical writings of Pierre Bourdieu, this paper has highlighted how  
51 football fan cultures are reproduced and altered across time through interactions between  
52 various groups of people with differing levels of cultural authority. As Bourdieu asserts,  
53 within any field there are dominant players (such as football club owners and board  
54 members) that can readily influence the direction of cultural practice due to the accumulative  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



capital that they possess. In addition however, he makes clear that institutional change is also reinforced and challenged through the everyday practice of agents with limited accumulative capital but with a vested interest in associated cultural matters (football fans) as they comprehend, contribute and adapt to new ideas presented within the field. Moreover, he points out how in circumstances of rapid institutional change (based largely on new conditions of existence [in this instance the adoption of neo-liberal philosophy]) situations of hysteresis can develop as the field undergoes, what some consider to be a major crisis.

This position was highlighted on numerous occasions throughout the *TM* in relation to a power imbalance between owners and fans at NUFC. For instance, the initial power struggles between Hall and McKeag, on the surface at least, may seem to have been distant and abstract from fans, but on closer inspection *TM* was complicit in support for Hall as he gathered impetus to enforce a change of leadership. Hall's leadership style was deemed desirable as it coincided with the wider acceptance of neo-liberal philosophy throughout the UK, a position that Bourdieu discusses in terms of his concept 'misrecognition'. He argues that the fact that neo-liberalism is presented as an economic inevitability rather than a political philosophy creates a situation where the mass majority of agents buy into a system that privileges the few at the expense of the many.

For example, when fans initially began to embrace their role as consumers in the new neo-liberal world of football they did so, on the premise that this may help them to negotiate a more inclusive relationship with the club owners / decision makers. At NUFC, this strategy was relatively successful for a while, with Hall maintaining his promise to offer shares to fans. But whilst the share issue ultimately failed largely due to the effects of a national recession, fans were pleased that (as a result of Halls leadership) the football stadium had been redesigned, and club facilities were improved.

Slowly however, as the popularity of Premier League football began to increase and demand for season tickets started to outweigh supply at NUFC, fanzine contributors began to experience what Bourdieu refers to as a 'double-bind', as they acknowledge the necessity of modernization (that they believed was required for club success), whilst simultaneously conceding that modernization would dramatically alter previously internalized fandom experiences, causing much anxiety in the process. This conflict of thought was evident in the reaction to various business strategies employed by the club as a response to an increase in



season ticket demand, forcing a dependent relationship rather than the desired inclusive association that fans (as consumers) were hoping for at the outset of John Halls tenure as club director. Perhaps this is best expressed by contributor, Chris Tait In issue 127 (October 1999) when he summarises the political situation at NUFC since the inception of *TM* with help from a well-known literary figure:

That George Orwell certainly knew the shape of things to come for fans of Newcastle United...To refresh your memory, the book describes how a motley collection of oppressed farm animals (let's call them the Magpie Group for arguments sake) deciding that enough is enough, band together, with enormous popular support around the farmyard and take control of the 'big house'. In doing so they rid themselves of the bullying farmer (Gordon McKeag anyone?) who has subjected them to years of abuse and tyranny. There is much rejoicing and quaffing at the trough as hope for the future is renewed once again. Things do in fact go well, initially at least. Before too long however, the revolution turns sour as the self-appointed leaders of the new order soon begin to impose their own power crazed ideology upon the farms inhabitants and the animals eventually conclude that things are as bad now, if not worse than they ever were under the farmer.<sup>72</sup>

In essence then, studying football fanzine *TM* has enabled us to view the effects of rapid institutional change (in the moment) on the values, dispositions and positions held by a group of fans as they (1) campaigned for neo-liberal leadership and then (2) were left to adapt to its unforeseen consequences. In the end, both the fan and the club epitomise the success of neo-liberal philosophy, but they play very different roles. Club owners invest material resources (on a grand scale) into the club, with the long term aim of returning a profit. Indeed, at Newcastle United the Hall and Sheppard families managed to extract £145 million, despite the clubs miniscule profits and overall losses.<sup>73</sup> Conversely, fans invest emotionally in the team and consequently they become regular consumers of match tickets, club merchandise (inadvertently advertising commercial sponsors), Sky television and other forms of consumption, hence collectively upholding and reaffirming the ultimate triumph of neo-liberal leadership and consumer culture through their actions. Thus, despite a willingness to fight, complain and verbalize the discomfort felt as the hysteresis effect takes over, fans were ultimately complicit in their own subordination. They are, as Bourdieu would describe,

victims of symbolic violence.

END NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Millward ‘The rebirth of the football fanzine’.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbons and Dixon ‘Surfs up! A call to take English soccer fan interactions on the internet more seriously.’

<sup>3</sup> Dixon ‘Learning the game: Football fandom culture and origins of practice’.

<sup>4</sup> Wacquant, *Pierre Bourdieu*.

<sup>5</sup> Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 78.

<sup>6</sup> Gibbons, Dixon and Braye ‘The way it was: An account of soccer violence in the 1980s’; Cleland and Dixon ‘Black and whiteness: the relative powerlessness of ‘active’ supporter organization mobility at English Premier League football’.

<sup>7</sup> Russell, *Football and the English: A social history of Association Football in England, 1863-1995*.

<sup>8</sup> Horne, *Sport in Consumer Culture*.

<sup>9</sup> Conn, *The Football Business*, 57.

<sup>10</sup> Cashmore, *Making Sense of Sport: Fifth edition*.

<sup>11</sup> King *End of the terraces: The transformation of English Football in the 1990s*, 49.

<sup>12</sup> Guttman, *Sport Spectators*.

<sup>13</sup> Rider ‘Why soccer is into injury time’, *The Times* August 8, 1882.

<sup>14</sup> Smith and Stewart ‘The travelling fan: understanding the mechanisms of sport fan consumption in the sport tourism setting’.

<sup>15</sup> Dixon, *Consuming Football in Late Modern Life*.

<sup>16</sup> Millward, ‘The rebirth of the football fanzine’.

<sup>17</sup> Ticher, ‘Foul: best of footballs alternative papers 1972-1976’.

<sup>18</sup> Domeneghetti, *From the back page to the front room*, 184.

<sup>19</sup> Harte, ‘The Fans Strike Back: Football fanzines in Britain 1972-1992’.

<sup>20</sup> Gray, *Doing Research in the Real World 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*, p.215

<sup>21</sup> Miles, Huberman and Saldana ‘*Qualitative Data Analysis: A methods sourcebook: edition 3*’.

<sup>22</sup> Bourdieu, ‘*Pascalian Meditations*’.

<sup>23</sup> *TM* September, Issue 2, 1988.

<sup>24</sup> Moorehouse, ‘From zines like these? Fanzines, traditions and identity in Scottish football’, 173-194.

<sup>25</sup> King, *The European Ritual*; Sandvoss, *A game of two halves: football television and globalization*; Crawford, *Consuming sport: fans, sport and culture*.

<sup>26</sup> Goldblatt, *The game of our lives: the meaning and making of English football*.

<sup>27</sup> Williams, ‘The “new football” in England and Sir John Hall’s new “Geordie Nation”’.

<sup>28</sup> BBC North East News, ‘John Hall’s Magpie Group Pledge’, 1988.

<sup>29</sup> Tyne-Tees News, ‘John Hall speaks in relation to ‘The Magpie Group’ 1988.

<sup>30</sup> Goldblatt, *The ball is round: A global history of football*.

<sup>31</sup> *TM* September 1988, Issue 2, p.8.

- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10
  - 11
  - 12
  - 13
  - 14
  - 15
  - 16
  - 17
  - 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - 21
  - 22
  - 23
  - 24
  - 25
  - 26
  - 27
  - 28
  - 29
  - 30
  - 31
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34
  - 35
  - 36
  - 37
  - 38
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41
  - 42
  - 43
  - 44
  - 45
  - 46
  - 47
  - 48
  - 49
  - 50
  - 51
  - 52
  - 53
  - 54
  - 55
  - 56
  - 57
  - 58
  - 59
  - 60
- 
- <sup>32</sup> *TM* September 1988, Issue 2, p.1.
- <sup>33</sup> *TM* February 1990, Issue 14, p.17.
- <sup>34</sup> Kennedy and Kennedy, *Football Supporters and the Commercialisation of Football*.
- <sup>35</sup> McGill, *Football Inc. How soccer fans are losing the game*.
- <sup>36</sup> *TM* January 1991, Issue 23, p.10.
- <sup>37</sup> *TM* September 1991, Issue 28, p.21.
- <sup>38</sup> *TM* December 1991, issue 31, p.2.
- <sup>39</sup> Bourdieu, *Pascalian Meditations*.
- <sup>40</sup> *TM* February 1990, Issues 14 and 16, April 1990.
- <sup>41</sup> *TM*, February 1990, Issue 14, p.9.
- <sup>42</sup> Bryman, *The Disneyization of Society*.
- <sup>43</sup> Dixon, 'Consumption'.
- <sup>44</sup> *TM* August 1990, Issue 18, p.14.
- <sup>45</sup> Wagg, *British Football and Social Exclusion*.
- <sup>46</sup> Boyle and Haynes, *Sport in the Media and Popular Culture*; Boyle and Haynes, *Football in the New Media Age*.
- <sup>47</sup> *TM*, September 1993, Issue 54, p.2.
- <sup>48</sup> Horton, *Moving the Goalposts: Footballs Exploitation*, 122.
- <sup>49</sup> Haynes, 'Media'.
- <sup>50</sup> See *TM*, Issue 28, p.11; Issue 29, p.16; Issue 54, p. 2; Issue 59, p.9.
- <sup>51</sup> For a more in depth discussion of this issue see Lasch, *The Degradation of Sport, the Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations*; Boyle and Haynes, *Sport in the Media and Popular Culture*.
- <sup>52</sup> *TM* January 1994, p.52.
- <sup>53</sup> Giulianotti, *Football: A sociology of the global game*.
- <sup>54</sup> *TM* September 1993, Issue 54, p.3.
- <sup>55</sup> Kennedy and Kennedy, *Football Supporters and the Commercialisation of Football*.
- <sup>56</sup> *TM*, September 1993, issue 54, p.3
- <sup>57</sup> *TM*, July 1994, Issue 65, p.3.
- <sup>58</sup> The bond was a successful financial venture, netting the club an extra £3.6 Million – see McGill, *Football Inc.* 219.
- <sup>59</sup> Giulianotti, *Football: A sociology of the global game*; Crabbe and Brown, 'You're not welcome any more: Football, class and social exclusion'; Morrow, *The Peoples Game? Football, Finance and Society*.
- <sup>60</sup> *TM*, October 1994, Issue 69, p.15.
- <sup>61</sup> *TM*, September 1996, Issue 92, p.25.
- <sup>62</sup> Wagg, *British Football and Social Exclusion*
- <sup>63</sup> McGill, *Football Inc. How soccer fans are losing the game*.
- <sup>64</sup> Conn, 'How the Geordie Nation turned into a cash cow', *The Guardian Online*, 2006.
- <sup>65</sup> *TM*, October 1999, issue 127, 15.
- <sup>66</sup> King, *End of the Terraces*.

<sup>67</sup> Giulianotti, *Football: A sociology of the global game*; Crabbe and Brown, ‘You’re not welcome any more: Football, class and social exclusion’; Morrow, *The Peoples Game? Football, Finance and Society*.

<sup>68</sup> Taylor, *Rt. Hon Lord Justice*, ‘The Hillsborough Stadium Disaster: Final Report’. London: HMSO.

<sup>69</sup> *TM*, October 1999, issue 127, 6.

<sup>70</sup> BBC Sport, ‘United waive fans court costs’, 2000.

<sup>71</sup> Conn, ‘How the Geordie Nation turned into a Cash Cow’.

<sup>72</sup> *TM*, October 1999, Issue 127, p.8.

<sup>73</sup> Goldblatt, *The Game of Our Lives: The meaning and making of English Football*.

**References**

BBC North East News. ‘John Hall’s ‘Magpie Group’ pledge. Newcastle Unites Future’. BBC North East News 1988 Available: <http://bit.ly/1eUPCVw>. Accessed August 2015.

BBC Sport Online. ‘United waive fans court costs’. *BBC Sport Online*, November 2000. <http://bbc.in/1LOwJm6>. Accessed August 2015.

Bourdieu, P. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Bourdieu, P. *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.

Boyle, R. and R. Haynes. *Sport, the Media, and Popular Culture*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2000.

Boyle, R. and R. Haynes. *Football in the New Media Age*. London: Routledge, 2004).

Bryman, A. *The Disneyization of Society*. London: Sage, 2004.

Cashmore, E. *Making Sense of Sport: fifth edition*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Cleland, J. and K. Dixon. ‘Black and whiter’s: The relative powerlessness of ‘active’ supporter organization mobility at English Premier League football clubs’. *Soccer & Society* 16 no 4 (2015): 540-554. DOI: 10.1080/14660970.2014.891988

Conn, D. How the Geordie Nation turned into a cash cow. *The Guardian Online*. (2006).  
Available: <http://bit.ly/1IP5vZJ>. Accessed August 2015.

Crabbe, T and A. Brown. 'You're not welcome anymore: the football crowd, class and social exclusion' in *British Football and Social Exclusion*, edited by S. Wagg, 26-46. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004.

Crawford, G. *Consuming Sport: Fans, Sport and Culture*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Dixon, K. 'Consumption'. In *Studying Football*, edited by E. Cashmore and K. Dixon, 154-179. London: Routledge, 2016.

Dixon K. 'Learning the game: Football fandom culture and origins of practice'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 48, no3 (2013a): 334-348.  
DOI:10.1177/1012690212441157

Dixon, K. *Consuming Football in Late Modern Life*. London: Ashgate, 2013b.

Domeneghetti, R. *From the Back Page to the Front Room: Football's journey through the English media*. Huddersfield: Ockley, 2014.

Gibbons, T. and K. Dixon. "'Surf's up!': A call to take English soccer fan interactions on the internet more seriously'. *Soccer & Society* 11, no. 5 (2010): 599-613. DOI: 10.1080/14660970.2010.497359

Gibbons, T. K. Dixon, and S. Braye. "'The way it was': an account of soccer violence in the 1980s'. *Soccer & Society* 9, no. 1 (2008): 28-41. DOI: 10.1080/14660970701616704

Giulianotti, R. *Football: A sociology of the global game*. Cambridge: Polity. 1999.

Goldblatt, D. *The ball is round: A global history of football*. Suffolk: Penguin books, 2010.

Goldblatt, D. *The Game of Our Lives: The Meaning and Making of English Football*. Falkirk: Penguin, 2015.

Guttmann. A. *Sport Spectators*. USA: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Gray, D. *Doing Research in the Real World, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Los Angeles, USA: Sage, 2018.

Harte, C. 'The Fans Strike Back: Football Fanzines in Britain, 1972-1992'. *NASSH Proceedings* (1993), 53.

Haynes, R. 'Media'. In *Studying Football*, edited by E. Cashmore and K. Dixon, 113-132. London: Routledge, 2016

Horne, J. *Sport in Consumer Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006.

Horton, E. *Moving the Goalposts: Football's Exploitation*. Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing, 1997.

Kennedy, P, and D. Kennedy. *Football Supporters and the Commercialisation of Football: Comparative responses across Europe*. London: Routledge, 2013.

King, A. *The End of Terraces: The Transformation of English Football in the 1990s*. London: Leicester University Press, 1988.

King, A. *The European Ritual*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2002.

Lasch, C. *The Degradation of Sport, the Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations*. New York: Norton and Company, 1979.

McGill, C. *Football Inc. How soccer fans are losing the game*. London: Vison Paperbacks, 2001.

Miles, M. M. Huberman, and J. Saldana. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A methods sourcebook (Edition 3)*. London: Sage, 2013.

Millward, P. The rebirth of the football fanzine: Using E-Zines as a data source. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 32, no 3 (2008), 299-310. DOI: 10.1177/0193723508319718

Moorehouse, H. F. 'From zines like these? Fanzines, tradition and identity in Scottish football'. In *Scottish sport and the making of the nation: Ninety minute patriots*, edited by G. Jarvie and G. Walker, 173-194. Leicester: University of Leicester Press, 1994.

Morrow, S. *The People's Game? Football, Finance and Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003.

Rider, R. 'Why soccer is into injury time'. *The Times* August 8 (1982): 8.

Russell, D. *Football and the English: A social history of Association Football in England, 1863-1995*. Preston: Carnegie, 1997.

Sandvoss, C. *A Game of Two Halves: Football, Television and Globalization*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Smith, A. and B. Stewart. 'The travelling fan: understanding the mechanisms of sport fan consumption in the sport tourism setting'. *Journal of Sport and Tourism* 12, no. 3-4 (2007), 155-81. DOI: 10.1080/14775080701736924

Ticher, M. *Foul: best of footballs alternative papers 1972-1976* (Simon Schuster: London, 1987).

Tyne-Tees News. 'John Hall speaks in relation to *The Magpie Group*' 1988. Available: <http://bit.ly/1Jsuf72>. Accessed April 2015.

Wacquant, L. 'Pierre Bourdieu'. In *Key Sociological Thinkers: Second Edition*, edited by R. Stones, 261-277. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008.

Wagg, S. Fat city? British football and the politics of social exclusion at the turn of the twenty-first century, 1-25. In *British Football and Social Exclusion*, edited by S. Wagg, 1-25. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004.

Williams, J. 'The "new football" in England and Sir John Halls, new "Geordie Nation"'. In *Football and Regional Identity in Europe*, edited by S. Gehrmann, Munster: Lit Verlag, 1997.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

For Peer Review Only



## Figures

Figure 1: Issue 1 August 1988 / Issue 289 April 2014



Figure 2 John Hall (left) and Gordon McKeag (right)





Figure 3: (Left) January 1995, Issue 73: 24; (Right) July 1994, Issue 65: 16)



Figure 4: September 1996, Issue 92: 25



Figure 5: Forecast for the future: Issue 127 (Left: 10) (Right: 14)



Tables:

Table 1: Sample of Fanzines Available for Analysis

<i>Year</i>	<i>Issue Number of Fanzine Editions Available for Analysis</i>	<i>Total Number of Fanzine Editions Available Per Year</i>
<i>1988</i>	1, 2, 3	3
<i>1989</i>	4, 7, 9, 10, 11.	5
<i>1990</i>	13, 14, 16, 18, 21.	5
<i>1991</i>	23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31.	7
<i>1992</i>	33, 34, 36, 38, 40, 43.	6
<i>1993</i>	46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 57	7
<i>1994</i>	59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71	9
<i>1995</i>	73, 75, 77, 78, 81, 82, 84, 85	8
<i>1996</i>	86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95.	9
<i>1997</i>	96, 97, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105.	7
<i>1998</i>	107, 108, 109, 114, 115, 116, 117	7
<i>1999</i>	120, 122, 125, 127.	4
<i>Total</i>		77